

REMARKS

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated November 30, 2004 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 have been amended. Claims 1-13 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-6 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ARA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,637,007 to *Suzuki et al.* (hereinafter “*Suzuki*”). The rejection of claims 1, 3-6 and 8-12 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is hereby requested.

None of the cited references disclose all the elements recited in claims 1 3-6 and 8-12. As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicants respectfully submit that neither the ARA, nor *Suzuki*, either singularly or in combination, disclose all the elements recited in claims 1, 3-6 and 8-12, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In particular, independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that the claim recites a lamp apparatus for a liquid crystal display having in part “a resin in the holder between both the soldering and the holder and the wire and the holder.” Neither the ARA nor *Suzuki*, either singularly or in combination, disclose this feature. Furthermore, neither reference suggests such a combination. Thus, the Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because all the claimed limitations are not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Claim 3 is also allowable over the cited references as claim 3 recites a liquid crystal display module comprising, in part, “a resin in the holder between both the soldering and the holder and the wire and the holder.” As discussed above, neither the ARA nor *Suzuki*, either

singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest this feature. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the ARA in view of *Suzuki* and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 4, which depends from claim 3, is also patentable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, claim 5 is similarly allowable over the cited references in that the claim recites a lamp apparatus for a liquid crystal display which includes, among other features, “a resin provided at an end of the lamp housing in such a manner to enclose the wire at the end of the lamp housing where the resin reinforces the soldering such that the soldering resists external forces, wherein the resin is disposed between the wire and the housing.” Neither the ARA nor *Suzuki*, either singularly or in combination, discloses or suggests a resin which is disposed between a wire and a housing, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As such, claim 5 is patentable over the ARA in view of *Suzuki* and the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claim 6, which depends from claim 5, is also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 8 is similarly allowable over the cited references. For example, claim 8 recites a liquid crystal display module having, among other features, “a resin provided at an end of the lamp housing in such a manner to enclose the wire at the end of the lamp housing where the resin reinforces the soldering such that the soldering resists external forces, wherein the resin is disposed between the wire and the housing.” As previously discussed, neither of the cited references, namely the ARA nor *Suzuki*, disclose or suggest this feature, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The ARA does not disclose the use of a resin. Likewise, *Suzuki* does not disclose a resin “wherein the resin is disposed between the wire and the housing.” Accordingly, claim 8 is patentable over the ARA in view of *Suzuki* and the Applicants respectfully request that

the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claim 9, which depends from claim 8, is also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Moreover, independent claim 10 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 10 recites a lamp apparatus for a liquid crystal display having, among other features, “a resin around an end of the wire where the resin reinforces the soldering such that the soldering resists external forces, wherein the resin is disposed between the wire and the housing.” As described above, none of the cited references, either singularly or in combination, discloses or suggests this feature. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the ARA in view of *Suzuki* and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 11 and 12, which depend from claim 10, are also patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

The Office Action also rejected claims 2, 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ARA in view of *Suzuki* as applied to claims 1, 5 and 10 above, and further in view of JP 04046314 A to *Saito* (hereinafter “*Saito*”). As discussed above, claim 1, from which claim 2 depends, is patentably distinct over the ARA in view of *Suzuki*. The Applicants submit that *Saito* does not address the shortcomings of both the ARA and *Suzuki*. More specifically, *Saito* does not disclose “a resin in the holder between both the soldering and the holder and the wire and the holder” as recited in claim 1. Likewise, claim 5, from which claim 7 depends, is patentably distinct over the ARA in view of *Suzuki*, as previously discussed. *Saito* does not cure the deficiencies of either the ARA or *Suzuki*. In particular, *Saito* does not disclose “a resin provided at an end of the lamp housing in such a manner to enclose the wire at the end of the lamp housing where the resin reinforces the soldering such that the soldering resists external forces, wherein the resin is disposed between the wire and the housing” as recited in claim 5. Moreover, claim 10, from which claim 13 depends, is patentably distinct over the ARA

in view *Suzuki*, as previously discussed. *Saito* does not cure the deficiencies of either the ARA or *Suzuki* as applied to claim 10. Specifically, *Saito* does not teach a “a resin around an end of the wire where the resin reinforces the soldering such that the soldering resists external forces, wherein the resin is disposed between the wire and the housing” as recited in claim 10.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and claims 2, 7 and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the ARA in view of *Suzuki* as applied to claims 1, 5 and 10 above and further in view of *Saito* and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

The Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner of Patents to charge any fees necessary to complete this filing, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, or credit any overpayment in fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for the necessary extension of time.

Dated: March 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes Reg. No.
for Rebecca Goldman Rudick 53,005
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant